

6-21-1999

## Effect of crop canopy on spray coverage

Robert G. Hartzler

Iowa State University, hartzler@iastate.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cropnews>

 Part of the [Agricultural Science Commons](#), [Agriculture Commons](#), [Agronomy and Crop Sciences Commons](#), and the [Weed Science Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Hartzler, Robert G., "Effect of crop canopy on spray coverage" (1999). *Integrated Crop Management News*. 2136.  
<http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cropnews/2136>

**The Iowa State University Digital Repository provides access to Integrated Crop Management News for historical purposes only. Users are hereby notified that the content may be inaccurate, out of date, incomplete and/or may not meet the needs and requirements of the user. Users should make their own assessment of the information and whether it is suitable for their intended purpose. For current information on integrated crop management from Iowa State University Extension and Outreach, please visit <https://crops.extension.iastate.edu/>.**

---

# Effect of crop canopy on spray coverage

## **Abstract**

This season's weather has resulted in many fields having to be treated with what must be considered less-than-timely herbicide applications. This situation creates several problems for applicators, one of them being obtaining adequate coverage of the target. The developing crop canopy intercepts much of the spray, thereby decreasing coverage of the weeds and exposing the crop to higher-than-label rates. Spraying fields with large crops present (>10 inches in height) can, therefore, result in poor weed control, crop injury, or both.

## **Keywords**

Agronomy

## **Disciplines**

Agricultural Science | Agriculture | Agronomy and Crop Sciences | Weed Science

# INTEGRATED CROP MANAGEMENT

## Effect of crop canopy on spray coverage

This season's weather has resulted in many fields having to be treated with what must be considered less-than-timely herbicide applications. This situation creates several problems for applicators, one of them being obtaining adequate coverage of the target. The developing crop canopy intercepts much of the spray, thereby decreasing coverage of the weeds and exposing the crop to higher-than-label rates. Spraying fields with large crops present (>10 inches in height) can, therefore, result in poor weed control, crop injury, or both.

When a spray boom is set up properly, it applies the desired rate of product uniformly across the width of the boom at a specific distance below the nozzles. Uniform application can only be achieved if the boom is set at the proper height for the target. Delays in applications may result in the crop canopy being significantly above the intended target--the weed canopy. Under these conditions, the crop not only interferes with distribution of the herbicide onto the weeds but also the crop may be exposed to excessive herbicide rates. The effect of the height differential between crop and target on the potential rate to which the crop is exposed is shown in the table. For this data set, it is assumed that the target (weed canopy) is 4 inches above the soil surface and that the boom is set up to be operated 28 inches above the target. Crop rows that are directly beneath a nozzle receive the maximum dose, whereas rows positioned to the side of nozzles would be treated with somewhat less herbicide than listed in the table. In this example, 12-inch corn treated with 0.67 oz/acre of Accent could potentially receive a dose of 0.94 oz Accent/acre, whereas 16-inch corn could be treated with up to 1.17 oz/acre.

The potential for spray coverage problems increases as height differential between the target and crop canopy increases. The only real solution to the problem is to use drop nozzles where the nozzles are placed directly over the row middle. Raising the boom height will do little to alleviate problems with coverage but will increase the potential for herbicide drift into adjacent fields.

### Influence of crop height on interception of spray solution.

Crop height (in inches)	% of desired application rate intercepted by crop canopy

4	100
8	117
12	140
16	175

This article originally appeared on page 115 of the IC-482(15) -- June 21, 1999 issue.

---

**Source URL:**

<http://www.ipm.iastate.edu/ipm/icm//ipm/icm/1999/6-21-1999/cropcan.html>

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY**  
University Extension